arXiv:astro-ph/0510692v1 24 Oct 2005

Comment on "On curvature coupling and quintessence fine-tuning"

Urbano França*
SISSA / ISAS, Astrophysics Sector, Via Beirut 4, 34014, Trieste, Italy

In this comment, we show explicitly that the phenomenological model in which the quintessence field depends linearly on the energy density of the spatial curvature can provide acceleration for the universe, contrary to recent claims it could not.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq

Recently Gong *et al.* [1] have stated that the phenomenological model proposed in [2] would not be able to provide the current acceleration of the universe. This conclusion is based on the equation (3) of their paper, that we reproduce here,

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{1}{6m_p^2}[\rho_M + 2\rho_R + 2(\rho_\phi + p_\phi)] \ , \tag{1}$$

where $m_p^2 = (8\pi G)^{-1}$, M, R and ϕ denotes matter, radiation and quintessence, respectively, and a is the scale factor. As usual, $\rho_\phi = \dot{\phi}^2/2 + U$, $p_\phi = \dot{\phi}^2/2 - U$, and $U = -\rho_k \exp(\lambda\phi/m_p) \equiv (3m_p^2 k/a^2)\exp(\lambda\phi/m_p)$. Dots denote derivative with repect to cosmic time t. As we will show below, this equation is not correct, and therefore it leads to misleading conclusions.

The Friedmann equation is given by

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{3m_p^2}(\rho_M + \rho_R + \rho_k + \rho_\phi) \ , \tag{2}$$

and its derivative with respect to cosmic time t reads

$$\dot{H} = \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} - H^2 = -\frac{1}{6m_p^2}(3\rho_M + 4\rho_R + 2\rho_k + 3\dot{\phi}^2) \ , \tag{3}$$

where we had only taken the derivatives of both sides of eq. (2) and used the fluid equations[1], $\dot{\rho}_i = -3H(\rho_i + p_i)$, $i = M, R, k$ and ϕ. Thus, we have that

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{1}{6m_p^2}[\rho_M + 2\rho_R + 2(\dot{\phi}^2 - U)] \ , \tag{4}$$

and since $\rho_\phi + 3p_\phi = 2(\dot{\phi}^2 - U)$, this is precisely

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{1}{6m_p^2}[\rho_M + 2\rho_R + \rho_\phi + 3p_\phi] \ , \tag{5}$$

which is the expected result, even when the spatial curvature of the universe is not zero (see [3], for instance). This result is clearly different from eq. (1), and in the regime in which the field has its energy dominated by the potential term it is able to provide the acceleration of the universe without any problems.

Therefore, since the model proposed in [2] works, contrary to the conclusions obtained in [1], there is no reason to do the changes proposed to obtain cosmologically acceptable solutions that can solve the coincidence problem.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thanks Thomas P. Sotiriou for enlightening discussions, and Yungui Gong for very interesting correspondence.

---

*Electronic address: urbano@sissa.it

[1] For details about the use of the fluid equation for the field, see the appendix.

APPENDIX A: EQUIVALENCE OF FLUID AND KLEIN-GORDON EQUATIONS

Conservation of the total energy-momentum tensor requires that

$$\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0 \ . \tag{A1}$$

For a scalar field, the energy-momentum tensor is given by

$$T^{\mu\nu}_\phi = \partial^\mu\phi\partial^\nu\phi - g^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L} = \partial^\mu\phi\partial^\nu\phi - g^{\mu\nu}\left(\frac{1}{2}\partial_\alpha\phi\partial^\alpha\phi - U\right) \ , \tag{A2}$$

and in the case in which each energy-momentum tensor is conserved separately, one can show that for $\nu = 0$,

$$\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu}_\phi = (\partial_0 + \Gamma^\mu_{\mu 0})T^{00} + \Gamma^0_{ii}T^{ii} = 0 \ , \tag{A3}$$

where $i = 1, 2, 3$ denotes the spatial components of the metric. Therefore, if one uses the energy-momentum tensor for a perfect fluid,

$$T^{\mu\nu}_\phi = (\rho + p)u^\mu u^\nu - g^{\mu\nu}p \ , \tag{A4}$$

equation (A3) gives the well known fluid equation,

$$\dot\rho_\phi + 3H(\rho_\phi + p_\phi) = 0 \ . \tag{A5}$$

On the other hand, if one uses equation (A2), equation (A3) reads

$$\ddot\phi + 3H\dot\phi + \frac{\partial U}{\partial\phi} + \frac{\dot a}{\dot\phi}\frac{\partial U}{\partial a} = 0 \ , \tag{A6}$$

that is the Klein-Gordon equation of this field. Notice that it differs from the Klein-Gordon used in [1], since it has the term with the derivative with respect to the scale factor a. This equation has the “extra” term given in the scalar field equation of [2] when compared to the scalar field equation given in [1].

Such a Klein-Gordon equation cannot be immediately obtained using regular Euler-Lagrange equation, since this procedure requires the Lagrangian *to be dependent on the field ϕ and its first derivative $\partial_\mu\phi$ only.* The *phenomenological* Lagragian we used in [2] has also an explicit dependence on a, through the curvature, what does not allow one to use regular Euler-Lagrange equation for deriving the equation of motion of the field. Therefore, unless one can obtain a covariant form of writing such a Lagrangian, the only way of obtaining the equations of motion of the scalar field is requiring its energy-momentum tensor to be conserved. Whether or not such a dependence can be obtained in a realistic model is something that was beyond the scope of [2], and it is currently under investigation. However, once one accepts it, the steps described must be followed, otherwise one would run against inconsistencies.

Summing up, both fluid and Klein-Gordon equations have to be consistent, equivalent, and equally able to describe the behaviour of the field.

---

[1] Y. Gong, A. Wang and Y. Zhang, `hep-th/0510179`, v1 - 20 Oct 2005.
[2] U. França, `astro-ph/0509177`, v1 - 7 Sep 2005.
[3] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, “The Early Universe”, Redwood City, USA, Addison-Wesley (1990), chapter 3.